

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/630,752

Applicant(s)

BAUM ET AL

Examiner

Michael Misiaszek

Art Unit

3625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Misiaszek.

(3) _____.

(2) Xin Wen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 June 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 17 and 56.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner indicated that claims 17 and 56 were considered improperly dependent, and suggested applicant either cancel the claims or amend them into independent form via an Examiner's Amendment. Applicant elected to cancel the claims via an Examiner's Amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.